REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 4 October, 2004. Responsive to the rejections made in the Office Action, Claims 1, 7, and 8 have been amended to clarify the combination of elements which forms the invention of the subject Patent Application and Claims 3, 5, and 6 have been cancelled by this Amendment. Additionally, Claims 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12 have been amended to correct the dependency and/or the language thereof.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner stated that it was not clear how the clamping mechanism clamps the second electrical plug because it is coupled to the first electrical plug.

It is respectfully submitted that the clamping mechanism does not clamp the second electrical plug directly. As stated by the Examiner and disclosed in the Specification, the clamping mechanism clamps the first electrical plug. However, by virtue of the mechanical coupling between the first and second electrical plugs provided by the linking mechanism, clamping of the first electrical plug also prevents displacement of the second electrical plug when it is in either the retracted or protruded positions. In order to avoid confusion, Claim 1 has been amended to delete the reference to the second electrical plug being clamped. Thus, it is now believed that Specification provide a sufficient disclosure for one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicated that in claim 5 the phrase "the conductive members" was confusing. Further, the Examiner indicated that the phrase "the conductive wire" did not have sufficient antecedent basis for the described limitation in claim 12.

Claim 1, now incorporating the limitations of Claim 5, and Claim 12 have been amended to correct the language thereof. All of the limitations in those claims now have a proper antecedent basis. Thus, the claims now particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Eyman reference (U.S. Patent #6,382,996. Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyman in view of Baxter et al., U.S. Patent #6,109,977, and Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyman in view of Chung, U.S. Patent #6,325,665. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 5, 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to place those claims in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate substantially the subject matter of Claims 3 and 5 therein. Thus, Claim 5 has been effectively rewritten in independent

form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and the only intervening claim, Claim 3. Therefore, Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon should now be allowable. Claims 7 and 8 have respectively amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 1 and 3 therein. Thus, Claims 7 and 8 have each been placed in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and the only intervening claim, Claim 3. Therefore, Claims 7 and 8, and the claims now dependent on Claim 7 should now be allowable.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: ROSENBERG KLEIN & LEE

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 6 Jan. 2005

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586